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**Reviewer’s report:**

Minor essential revisions
This is a well written paper which aimed to assess the impact of prenatal supplementation on offspring mental development using a systematic review approach.

Abstract- say in the background that mental development included a number of dimensions as it is a little at odds to talk about the association of supplementation with better ‘child’ development.

Background
Is it ‘foetus’ or ‘fetus’ – you need to be consistent throughout.
Change ‘Barker demonstrated’ to Barker suggested

Methods- Search strategy
1st para -’selected randomised control trials (RCT)- then use RCT abbreviation throughout
2nd para- Remove ‘period of coverage noted below’

Dates should be 22 – 30 Dec 2009
Don’t need to give actual day of when additional search was performed

Inclusion criteria- 2nd par- was there any disagreement? Over how many papers? If not, say so.

Data extraction and quality appraisal - Remove ‘ Disagreement between the reviewers were resolved by discussion’

Results
2nd para- reduce para to ‘Due to study heterogeneity, we were not able to meta-analysis the studies’

Mental development outcomes- add ‘(not detectable when children were tested later in life) to transient in page 10

Strengths and weaknesses- discuss publication bias- null result studies may be less likely to be published and therefore not picked up by the review

I don't think the paper needs 3 tables and wonder whether the authors could include the informaiton in tables 2 and 3 into table 1?
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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